

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,614	12/16/2003	Itaru Momoki	INO-C384	2725
75	90 11/17/2004		EXAMINER	
LORUSSO, LOUD & KELLY 3137 Mount Vernon Avenue			. UNDERWOOD, DONALD W	
Alexandria, VA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3652	<u>-</u>
			DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	A 11 41 A1	4/->	/_
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	-Jj
Office Action Commence	10/735,614	MOMOKI, ITARU	,-
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Donald Underwood	3652	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/16	<u>5/03</u> .		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the ments is	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>5 and 6</u> is/are pending in the applicati	on.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>5 and 6</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.		
Application Papers	•		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) Dobjected to by the I	Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☑ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).	
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.	•	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No. 09/986,952.	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	• •	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
application from the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	, -	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.	٠.
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/16/03.	6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/735,614

Art Unit: 3652

Page 2

## **Detailed Action**

- 1. A copy of the priority papers, i.e., Japanese application 2000-364348, was received in parent case 09/986952.
- 2. The substitute specification has been approved. However the status of parent case 09/986,952 should be updated. This case is referenced in the cross-reference to related applications set forth by the preliminary amendment.
- 3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Bacchi et al '444.

Note 11 is synonymous with applicant's rotatable base, 92 is a first motor, 12 is a body, 80R is synonymous with applicant's first spindle, 50R is a second motor, 14R is a first arm, 62R is synonymous with applicant's second spindle, 22R is a second arm, 86R is synonymous with the third spindle, 30R is a third arm with the distal end synonymous with applicant's hand. Regarding applicant's control and straight line movement see figure 6 in Bacchi.

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3652

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bacchi et al '444.

The algorithm set forth in this claim would be inherent in the arm movement in Bacchi since its hand moves along a straight line parallel to a line through the pivoted center 13.

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 8. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,764,271. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims are broader and would prevent the practice of the patented invention once its patent term expired if allowed.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to D. Underwood at telephone number (703) 308-1113.

Nonaily L DONALD W. L

HIMARY FXAMINER

Underwood/vs November 8, 2004